

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: William C. Vickrey, Administrative Director of the Courts
Ronald G. Overholt, Chief Deputy Director
Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division and Chair, Trial Court
Budget Working Group, 415-865-7951

DATE: April 12, 2006

SUBJECT: Trial Court Budget Priorities for Fiscal Year 2006–2007 (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Judicial Council is required, under rule 6.101(b)(1) of the California Rules of Court, to establish responsible fiscal priorities to enable the judiciary to achieve its goals. This report presents recommendations to the council for budget priorities for the trial courts for fiscal year (FY) 2006–2007.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Working Group (TCBWG) and staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recommend that the Judicial Council take the following action:

1. Approve the following statewide budget priorities for trial courts for FY 2006–2007:
 - Self-help programs;
 - Staffing and operating costs for new facilities in FY 2006–2007 (including unfunded costs for transferred facilities); and
 - Administrative services and technology infrastructure.
2. Direct staff to collect information from the trial courts to determine the costs for funding these priority areas, work with the TCBWG once the final FY 2006–2007 state appropriations limit (SAL) percentage rate is known, and provide recommendations to the council on what can be accomplished in these priority areas, based on the projected funding to be available through the SAL adjustment.

Rationale for Recommendation

Background

Each year, the Judicial Council approves budget priorities for the trial courts. Before FY 2005–2006, all areas of trial court operations and programs in which the courts needed increased funding could be considered Judicial Council priorities. For example, the priorities recommended to the council at its February 2004 business meeting for FY 2004–2005 were: court interpreters' workload growth; increased county charges for county-provided services; postage increases; trial court staff retirement; security negotiated salary increases (NSIs), retirement, and other benefits; trial court staff workers' compensation; pay equity adjustments; and trial court staff NSIs and benefits. For each approved priority, courts submitted either a budget change request or a survey from which AOC staff developed budget change proposals (BCPs), which were submitted as part of the annual trial court funding request sent to the Governor and the Legislature. Because of the lengthy budget development process, the budget priorities were usually approved by the council nearly a year and a half before the fiscal year for which they were proposed.

Beginning with FY 2005–2006, the trial court budget process changed with the implementation of an annual base budget adjustment based on the year-to-year percentage change in the SAL. The amount of the total SAL adjustment is calculated by multiplying the trial court base budget (which currently excludes judicial compensation) by the SAL growth rate. Since the final growth rate is not known until after the May Revision, the Governor's Budget includes a proposed amount of SAL funding based on an estimated growth rate. Once the final SAL growth rate is determined, the SAL adjustment funding is calculated. The resulting level of funding is then ultimately available for allocation to the trial courts. Because the SAL adjustment does not require the development and submission of BCPs, as in prior years, the need for detailed budget change requests has primarily been replaced with a smaller number of less-detailed surveys of actual costs. Judicial Council budget priorities for trial court funding have largely changed from being priorities related to budget requests to priorities for allocation of funding to the courts.

A SAL Growth Factor Allocation Template (template) was designed to display both the proposed funding and, once the council has voted, the final allocation of the SAL funds. With the use of the template, many of the program areas previously requested as priorities are no longer considered council priorities because they are addressed by the SAL funding adjustment process. Referring back to the list of priorities that were approved by the council for FY 2004–2005 and applying the SAL template, the overall funding available for most of these cost items would automatically grow by the SAL percentage rate, and the courts would receive funding to address increases, based on their actual costs, up to the total amount of funds in each program area. Had SAL been in effect for FY 2004–2005, court interpreters' workload growth, trial court staff retirement, and mandatory security increases all would have received this automatic growth.

Increased county charges, pay equity adjustments, postage increases, trial court employee compensation costs, and workers' compensation could be addressed through the Inflation & Workforce funding that all courts receive (line 14 in the FY 2005–2006 template on page 9). Pay equity adjustments could also be addressed through the Workload Growth & Equity funding if a court is considered underresourced (line 15 in the template on page 9).

The template for FY 2005–2006 was approved by the Judicial Council in June 2005. With the implementation of SAL and the template, the budget priorities are determined by the council only a few months before the Budget Act is enacted. Over the past several weeks, AOC staff have been soliciting input on the template for FY 2006–2007. The feedback received thus far has been favorable, and minimal revisions are anticipated. The recommended template for FY 2006–2007 will be part of the proposed trial court funding allocation to be presented to the council in August 2006. The FY 2005–2006 template is attached (see page 9) and will be referenced throughout the remainder of this report. Line numbers have been added to the left side of the form to assist in describing how the SAL and Judicial Council priority process works.

The template is divided into four distinct sections based on different types of allocations. Section I (beginning at line 6) addresses funding programs whose allocation is based on actual costs. This includes retirement funding for rate and plan changes and Judicial Council–approved priorities (beginning at line 8). In FY 2005–2006, the council approved two trial court budget priority areas and funding to address them. These were (1) increased interpreter costs due to the statutory requirement to begin paying expanded benefits (beyond mandatory salary-driven benefits) for new court interpreter employees and court interpreters pro tem and (2) increased costs for trial court staffing and operating expenses for new facilities opening in either FY 2004–2005 or FY 2005–2006. The purpose of designating Judicial Council budget priorities is to set aside funding from the SAL allocation to fund specific programs or costs that the council, with input from the Trial Court Budget Working Group, presiding judges, court executives, employee organizations, and other advisory groups, determines are priority areas for one-time or ongoing increases to be funded from the SAL adjustment.

Section II (beginning at line 13) includes court allocations (excluding security) that are not based on actual costs. These include Inflation & Workforce funding, which is provided to all courts to be used to address staff compensation and other operating costs at the courts' discretion (line 14) and Workload Growth & Equity funding (line 15) to be allocated only to those courts considered underresourced based on the Resource Allocation Study (RAS) model. These funds are also available to the courts meeting the criteria, to be used at their discretion.

Section III (line 17) includes SAL funding to address increases in mandatory security costs, such as salary, retirement, and other benefit increases (up to the amount generated

by the SAL percentage level when the security base budget is multiplied by the SAL growth factor).

Section IV (beginning at line 18) includes funding for reimbursement of the courts for specific types of items such as court-appointed counsel (line 20), jury (line 21), court interpreters (line 24), costs of prisoner hearings (line 26), and other local assistance programs, including drug courts (line 29) and court-appointed special advocates (line 30).

Recommendations for specific court allocations for council priority programs will be presented to the council at its August 25 business meeting. In addition, recommendations for allocation of the FY 2006–2007 SAL funding will also be presented at the August meeting for council action. In September, or on enactment of the Budget Act, the approved FY 2006–2007 funding allocations will be made to the courts.

This report deals with items that are recommended to be allocated from the funds designated for Judicial Council–approved priorities (line 8) and the process used to determine what these priority programs should be for FY 2006–2007.

In early 2006, AOC staff sought suggestions from a variety of sources on potential trial court funding priorities for FY 2006–2007. These sources included Judicial Council advisory committees through the AOC directors who provide staff to support them, trial court presiding judges, court executive officers, and the Collaborative Trial Court Employee Working Group (CTCEWG). This recently established working group consists of 28 members, including representatives of SEIU, AFSCME, Communications Workers of America, trial court human resources staff, trial court executive officers, and others. A full list of the potential budget priorities is included at pages 10–16.

The proposed priorities were provided for review and discussion to the Trial Court Budget Working Group at its meeting on March 8, 2006. Several of the suggested priority areas were determined to be items that should already be funded from within the courts' individual SAL allocation (Inflation & Workforce, line 14 on the template), or through reimbursement programs (lines 19 through 33) such as court-appointed counsel and jury costs, or items that are allocated directly from the SAL funding, based on actual costs, such as employee retirement rate and plan changes (line 7) and security (line 17). Some areas, such as the 2 percent automation funding, are being handled separately, and if the BCP included in the FY 2006–2007 Governor's Budget Proposal for administrative services infrastructure is approved, they will be funded, thus negating the need for consideration of priority funding. The list of potential priorities includes a column describing the rationale for including (or not including) them as TCBWG–recommended priorities.

After discussion, the working group recommended the following programs as priority areas for FY 2006–2007:

- Self-help programs;
- Staffing and operating costs for new facilities (including unfunded costs for transferred facilities); and
- Administrative services and technology infrastructure.

The current projected year-to-year percentage change in SAL for FY 2006–2007 is 4.7 percent. By comparison, the final SAL percentage for FY 2005–2006 was 6.44 percent. If the FY 2006–2007 SAL rate stays at or near the currently projected level, this will result in significantly less new funding available next year, in comparison to the current year, to maintain the courts’ existing programs and pay for mandatory cost increases, as well as to fund Judicial Council budget priorities. The TCBWG believes strongly that addressing mandatory cost increases for staff and programs is most critical, and that allocations for Judicial Council priorities should only be made if sufficient new funding is available.

After the council determines the trial court budget priorities for FY 2006–2007, AOC staff will collect data from the courts regarding their funding needs in these areas. The court requests will be reviewed and recommendations prepared. Once the final FY 2006–2007 SAL percentage rate is known, the TCBWG will meet to discuss the amount of funding that will be available through the SAL funding adjustment and how it should be allocated, based on the SAL template for existing trial court operational needs. It will review the staff recommendations for funding on the requests submitted for each of the Judicial Council priority areas and weigh how much funding that it will recommend should be allocated to them, keeping in mind the ongoing operational needs of the courts. If administrative services and technology infrastructure are a council priority, and if sufficient funding is not available through the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and the Trial Court Improvement Fund (TCIF) to address the courts’ requests for supplemental funding in this area, the TCBWG will make recommendations on how much, if any, of the SAL funding should be made available to address these costs. (Please see the separate council report, to be presented at the April council meeting, seeking approval of the Supplemental Funding Request Process for Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Services.) The working group’s recommendations will then be presented to the council in August.

A description of each of the three recommended priority areas follows.

Self-help programs

Data collected by the AOC indicates that most of the 6 million annual traffic filings involve self-represented litigants; at least half of the estimated 94,500 child custody mediation cases handled by the California courts each year have at least one or more self-represented parents; and in more than 63 percent of child support cases, neither parent has representation. In addition, all of the almost 400,000 annual small claims filings involve self-represented litigants. The establishment by courts of self-help programs and

centers assists in broadening and facilitating both access to and understanding of the court process for all persons served by the courts. This practice directly addresses a goal of the Judicial Council's long-term strategic plan—access, fairness, and diversity.

The 2005 *Trust and Confidence in the California Courts* survey of over 2,400 California adults included questions about barriers to taking a case to court. One of the recommendations resulting from the survey stated that California has been a national trailblazer in developing self-help centers and other information services and that those efforts should be expanded and carefully tailored to the specific needs of individual jurisdictions. Phase 2 of the council's trust and confidence assessment will explore what specific partnerships or expanded role for self-help centers—as well as other alternatives to court adjudication—could be developed. Clearly, this is an area that resonates with both the council and the public. Improving access to the court system through self-help programs and centers can produce benefits for the community as a whole. Benefits include enabling many self-represented litigants to use the court system more efficiently, reducing absences from work, and reducing the amount of time spent in court in handling these cases because litigants will come better prepared. Staff and the TCBWG believe that providing additional funding to courts to begin creating self-help programs or enhance existing programs should be a Judicial Council priority for the budget year, provided that sufficient funds are available through the SAL percentage change.

Staffing and operating costs for new facilities to be opened in FY 2006–2007 (including unfunded costs for transferred facilities)

To provide services more efficiently and safely, many courts are currently expanding and renovating existing buildings as well as planning and developing new courthouses. As a result of these activities, some courts may need additional funding for operating costs, including staffing, to make these new facilities operational.

As indicated previously, this was a Judicial Council budget priority for the current fiscal year. Guidelines and criteria have been established for reviewing requests for funding for staffing and operating costs for new facilities that would be used for future requests. The process involves reviewing a court's undesignated reserves in the TCTF and non-TCTF reported in the Quarterly Financial Statement to determine whether one-time costs can be absorbed. In addition, costs determined to be not allowable under rule 810 of the California Rules of Court are not considered. These guidelines provide that allocation of any approved funding for these costs will be made on a reimbursement basis. These requests will be reviewed by staff and recommendations made to the TCBWG. Requests for security costs for these facilities will be subject to the council-approved security standards and, if necessary, reviewed by the Court Security Working Group.

Administrative services and technology infrastructure

A number of statewide administrative and technology initiatives are currently being developed and deployed in the trial courts. These include the Court Accounting and

Reporting System (CARS), the California Case Management System (CCMS), the Courts Human Resources Information System (CHRIS), the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), and data integration, among others. These initiatives address the council's goal of independence and accountability by seeking funding and resources for the support and operation of the courts and the ability to responsibly account for the public resources necessary for their support. These programs will enable the courts to plan for and manage their funding, personnel, resources, and records.

These innovative systems are also directly responsive to the council's long-term strategic goal of technology, which directs that the AOC "design and put into place an infrastructure that will provide the staff, hardware, software, and technology management necessary to support the computing services and telecommunications required to meet the information technology needs of the judicial branch." As courts move from county-owned and county-provided infrastructure services to these new judicial branch-provided systems and services, they will be charged for specific expenses related to them (such as AOC staffing to provide court-specific services, and deployment for CCMS), while other costs will be paid on a statewide basis and not charged to the courts (such as most hardware and software maintenance and end-user training). Many of the costs to courts for these services will be offset by the fact that they will no longer be paying the county for them. However, it is possible that the cost to a court for one or more of these services may be more than it is able to afford, either because the county charge was less than the charge for the judicial branch-provided service, or because it is a service that it did not have before.

A procedure has been established whereby courts can request supplemental funding to address one-time, limited-term, and ongoing costs for these administrative services and technology infrastructure programs that will occur during the current year or budget year (and beyond), should they be unable to pay. Please see the detailed supplemental funding request process that is attached to the council report to be presented at this meeting, which specifically deals with this area. It is important to point out that funding for these supplemental funding requests will come first from any existing balances in the TCTF and the TCIF. Establishment of this item as a Judicial Council priority would provide the possibility of setting aside SAL funding, in the event that sufficient resources are not available through either of these funds. Using Judicial Council budget priority funding to address these costs will be done only as a last resort. If this area is made a council priority, but sufficient unallocated funds are available in the TCTF or TCIF without needing to resort to funding specifically set aside for Judicial Council priorities, and the authority to allocate these funds for this purpose is delegated to the Administrative Director of the Courts as is recommended in the council report for the supplemental funding request process, the council would not receive allocation recommendations for administrative infrastructure services.

Alternative Actions Considered

As mentioned previously, when the TCBWG met on March 8, it reviewed possible priority areas submitted by various trial courts and by the CTCEWG. A large number of potential programs were included. These areas were considered, but ultimately most were not recommended as priorities, for a variety of reasons. Please see the list of suggested priorities at pages 10–16 for the rationale for recommending (or not recommending) each suggested area. In addition, the working group and staff believed that, particularly based on the reduced level of the current projection for the SAL percentage rate (as compared to the rate for FY 2005–2006), a limited number of basic operational-related priorities that address Judicial Council goals would best serve the judicial branch at this time.

Comments From Interested Parties

In developing recommendations for trial court budget priorities, AOC staff sought input from trial court presiding judges, court executive officers, trial court employee associations (through the CTCEWG), and Judicial Council advisory committees. (Again, please see the list of suggested priority areas included at pages 10-16 of this report.) No other comments were received.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

Once budget priority areas are approved, AOC staff will obtain cost information from the courts and present it to the TCBWG. Recommendations for allocation of available funding will be presented to the Judicial Council at its August business meeting. Any allocations recommended to the council for these priority areas will be funded within the FY 2006–2007 trial court SAL allocation.

Attachments

**TRIAL COURT
SAL GROWTH FACTOR
ALLOCATION TEMPLATE
FY 2005-2006**

ADJUSTED SAL GROWTH FACTOR

Inflation & Workforce	0.000%
Workload Growth & Equity	<u>0.000%</u>
Total Adjusted SAL Growth Factor	0.000%

SAL GROWTH FACTOR

Inflation & Workforce	0.00%
Workload Growth & Equity	<u>0.00%</u>
Total SAL Growth Rate	0.00%

Line		A Base Budget Amount	B SAL/Other Factor	C SAL Adjustment* (A x B or Actual)
1	2005-2006 SAL FUNDING ADJUSTMENT			
2	Plus Excess Funds from Trial Court Trust Fund			
3	Transfer From Trial Court Trust Fund to Trial Courts			
4	Transfer To/From Trial Court Employee Retirement Account			-
5	TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION			\$ -
6	I. FUNDING BASED ON ACTUAL COSTS:			
7	A. Retirement Funding For Rate & Plan Changes			
8	B. Judicial Council Approved Priorities			
9	1.			
10	2.			
11	TOTAL FUNDING BASED ON ACTUAL COSTS			
12	FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION TO COURTS:			
13	II. Court Allocations (Excluding Security)			
14	A. Inflation & Workforce			
15	B. Workload Growth & Equity			
16	TOTAL COURT ALLOCATIONS (EXCLUDING SECURITY)			
17	III. Security			
18	IV. Trial Court Reimbursement & Local Assistance Funding			
19	A. Unscheduled Reimbursement Programs			
20	1. Court Appointed Counsel			
21	2. Jury			
22	3. Processing of Elder Abuse Protective Orders			
23	B. Scheduled Reimbursement & Local Assistance Programs			
24	1. Interpreters			
25	2. Extraordinary Homicide Trials			
26	3. Prisoner Hearings			
27	4. Services of Process for Protective Orders			
28	5. Other Local Assistance			
29	a. Drug Courts			
30	b. CASA			
31	c. Model Self-Help Program			
32	d. Civil Case Coordination			
33	e. Family Law Information Centers			
34	TOTAL TRIAL COURT REIMBURSEMENT & LOCAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS			
35	TOTAL FUNDING ALLOCATED TO COURTS			

* SAL adjustment amount rounded to nearest thousand by Department of Finance

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
CIPELC/SDCCEA	CCMS V-3 Deployment in San Diego	Trial Court Staffing & Operating Expense for the CCMS V-3 Deployment Project in San Diego.	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding that all courts receive is available for staffing. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.) To the extent that a court does not have adequate funding to pay these costs, they may request
Orange County Employees Association (OCEA)	Commuter Subsidy	The addition of an option that would allow for those courts in high cost of living areas to subsidize commuting costs.	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is funding available to address court employee compensation and benefit issues at the courts' discretion, including commuter subsidies. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Consultant for Community Focused-Group Meetings	Provide ongoing statewide consultant for Community-Focused Group Meetings and Planning.	A small grant program was recently put in place to provide all applying courts with funds -- up to approximately \$7,000 -- that can be used to conduct community forums for gathering stakeholder input to inform local court planning priorities. The funds can be used to employ consultants to conduct these meetings for the courts.
Monterey	Court Appointed Counsel	Provide funding for increased Court Appointed Counsel/Mediators/Investigators hourly rates.	The projected statewide costs of the Court Appointed Counsel program are budgeted as part of the SAL funding process. (Line 20 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Sacramento	Court Appointed Counsel		The projected statewide costs of the Court Appointed Counsel program are budgeted as part of the SAL funding process. (Line 20 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Stanislaus	Court Ordered Psychological Evaluations	Funding for court ordered psychological evaluations.	Beginning in FY 2005-06, these costs are being paid through a reimbursement process.
Monterey	Court Reporter Transcripts	Adjust baseline for court reporter transcripts in felony matters. Felony cases that are held to answer require court reporter transcripts, so if felony filings that at least move through to the held to answer stage increase, then the associated court reporter transcript costs will also increase. I was curious if the state has ever reviewed this area of potentially higher costs associated with increases in felony filings at least from the base line year.	Court reporters are part of the baseline budget. The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding that all courts receive is designed to address issues like this, at the court's discretion, if it is needed to meet increased costs like this. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.) On a statewide basis, the total cost of transcripts has been declining.
Orange County Employees Association (OCEA)	Employee Compensation	An overall one-time increase to the base budget for salaries and staffing, to provide a more realistic future platform for general salary increases and benefits improvements.	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is designed to address employee salaries and staffing. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.) To the extent that a court is currently paying salaries below market or staffing is inadequate, Equity and Workload Growth funding provided to underresourced courts may apply. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.) In addition, if SB 56, which is proposed to add 150 judges, is enacted, it will also add staffing for each new judge.
Orange County Employees Association (OCEA)	Employee Compensation	The prospective application of a compensation practice that is tied in some way to an objective economic indicator, such as the prior year's Consumer Price Index, or local market analyses.	The SAL formula includes the year-to-year change in per capita personal income in California. The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding, which every court receives, is available to the courts to address employee compensation. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Fresno	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	Complete RAS for underfunded courts to the 0% difference level.	The Workload Growth and Equity portion of the SAL allocation will continue to provide funding for courts that are underresourced within the approved guidelines. Once those that are the most severely underfunded are brought up, the guidelines may be adjusted to address less underresourced courts. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
Kings	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	Workload growth and equity funding	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is funding available to address court employee compensation issues at the courts' discretion, including pay parity. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.) The funding provided to courts meeting the criteria, that is based on the RAS model, can also be used for this purpose. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
San Bernardino	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	Further implementation of RAS model (under-resourced courts).	The Workload Growth and Equity portion of the SAL allocation will continue to provide funding for courts that are underresourced within the approved guidelines. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Santa Clara	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	Continue to support the use of the RAS funding model for under-funded courts, with a minor adjustment to the RAS formula, replacing the "Cost of Labor" index with the "Cost of Living" index to better reflect the California market.	The workload growth and equity part of the SAL allocation will continue to provide funding for courts that are underresourced within the approved guidelines. Once those that are the most severely underfunded are brought up, the guidelines may be adjusted. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Stanislaus	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	Continued equity adjustments for historically underfunded courts.	The Workload Growth and Equity portion of the SAL allocation will continue to provide funding for courts that are underresourced within the approved guidelines. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Yolo	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	Continue to fund courts according to needs reported in the RAS model for under-resourced courts, to include all under-funded courts and not just those that are 10% or more under-funded. A vast majority of funding priorities for this court and others are tied to court operations and delivering our strategic plan. And most deliverable include the need for increased staffing and equipment to meet our workload and projected growth. In addition the RAS model resources would help to deter the costs for staff needed to implement unfunded mandated legislation like AB139 and AB145 et cetera.	The Workload Growth and Equity portion of the SAL allocation will continue to provide funding for courts that are underresourced within the approved guidelines. Once those that are the most severely underfunded are brought up, the guidelines may be adjusted to address less underresourced courts. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Yuba	Equity Funding for Underfunded Courts (based on Resource Allocation Study)	A newly appointed judge recently returned from Judges' Orientation and wanted to know why Yuba doesn't have the same programs and resources that other courts have. It is all about a lack of funding.	The Workload Growth and Equity portion of the SAL allocation will continue to provide funding for courts that are underresourced within the approved guidelines. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
CIPELC/SDCCEA	Ergonomic Standards	Funding to upgrade courtrooms to meet ergonomic standard	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is funding available, at the court's discretion, to address ergonomic needs. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)
AOC Finance	Facilities	Operational costs related to opening new facilities.	This was a priority in FY 2005-06. New facilities will continue to open, so the group believed that this should continue as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
AOC Finance	Facilities	Unfunded lease related costs resulting from transfers.	Many facilities will transfer to state ownership in FY 2006-07. The group believed that the previous operational costs for new facilities council priority should be expanded to include these costs. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Fresno	Facilities	Funding for new facilities.	This was a priority in FY 2005-06. New facilities will continue to open, so the group believed that this should continue as a JC priority in FY 2006-07. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
Imperial	Facilities	Additional and adequate working space. Interim solutions are necessary pending the transfer of court facilities. Inadequate space for court operations impact the bottom line, access to justice and efficiency.	Making this a statewide priority was not recommended since most facilities are still a county responsibility. Where court resources exist, AOC staff are working with courts to implement interim solutions.
Kings	Facilities	Staffing and operating expenses for new facilities.	This was a priority in FY 2005-06. New facilities will continue to open, so the group believed that this should continue as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Facilities	New facilities. The whole area of facilities is in the infant stage as we work to transfer court facilities from county to state and needs to remain on the forefront of state priorities for a few years. As the complete responsibility transfers to the state, and to some extent courts locally, we will need additional staffing to manage the ongoing issues associated with work orders, keeping the facilities operating on a day to day basis, basically all of the services that are currently provided by county general services, to name a few routine, but ongoing areas.	For facilities transferred to date, the responsibilities indicated by the court are either being done by AOC staff or under contract with the county. As more facilities transfer, this may change and will be looked at then.
Solano	Facilities	The court wants to move into the historical courthouse and obtain some matching grants from the county. This is not part of the SB 1732 transfer. They also want to do some moving within an existing building where the county has vacated some space into which the court could move. The court would need money to make this move. They also want to centralize their space where their security systems are monitored and bailiffs meet for assignment.	Until seismic issues in the historical courthouse are resolved, state funding cannot be considered. Paying for additional space in the existing building is not being recommended as a statewide priority since most facilities have not transferred and this is still a county responsibility. Where court resources exist, AOC staff are working with courts to implement interim solutions.
Stanislaus	Facility Maintenance and Operational Costs	Facility Maintenance and Operational Costs (M & O) for courts that are funding such costs. If the court were to obtain additional space from the county for court operations the court would be responsible for M & O costs since the existing courthouse construction fund could not be used to support this.	Where court resources exist, AOC staff are working with courts to implement interim solutions.
Stanislaus	Family Court Mediation	Additional funding for family court mediation.	This was not identified as a statewide need for FY 2006-07 and is appropriate for funding from the Inflation and Workforce portion of SAL which is provided to all courts (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Santa Clara	Family Law/Probate	Funding for Criminal History checks in DV-related matters in Family/Probate Court.	Since the mandate is contingent on funding and because there is limited new funding, the TCBWG deferred this to a future year.
Glenn	FC 3150 reimbursement to the courts		The Court Appointed Counsel Subcommittee of the TCBWG recommended that in FY 2004-05, Court Appointed Counsel baseline funding of \$1.152 million be provided to 14 courts to address FC 3150 expenditures on a one-time only basis. Starting with FY 2005-06, the entire statewide amount of CAC funding would be allocated to dependency only and each court would be required to fund its own FC 3150 costs. The Judicial Council subsequently approved this recommendation at its June 24, 2005 business meeting. FC 3150 funding could be provided to the courts in the future if the council identifies it as a JC priority. However, as only one court specifically identified this as a possible priority, and other program costs were suggested by several courts, it was not recommended by the TCBWG as a priority for FY 2006-07.
Sacramento	Health		The Inflation & Workforce portion of the SAL funding that all courts receive is designed to address health benefit funding needs. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
Yolo	Implementation of Finance Policies and Procedures	Funding to help some courts implement Finance policy and procedures. For example; armored car service. There are other reporting requirements that require more staff.	For courts implementing CARS, they may request supplemental funding to address these needs. To the extent that other funds are not available, this is being recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.) To the extent that there are needs that cannot be addressed in this way, the Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is available to address this need. (Line 14 in the FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Infrastructure	Continue to adjust Court's baseline funding especially in areas of Infrastructure as courts continue to separate from the County.	This has been recommended as a FY 2006-07 JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
San Bernardino	Interpreter Services Expansion	Expanding Interpreter services into non-mandated areas.	This area will be looked at due to the introduction of AB 2302. Additional funds may be requested through a BCP in the fall of 2006.
San Bernardino	Jury	Something for jurors.	A new working group of court executives will soon begin meeting to discuss jury policies. Funding decisions in this area should be deferred pending the results of this group.
San Mateo	Negotiated Salary Increases (NSIs)	Funding for upcoming negotiated salary increases for court staff.	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is designed to address NSI funding needs. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Glenn	Pay Parity	Pay parity for court staff.	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is funding available to address court employee compensation issues at the courts' discretion, including pay parity. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.) The Workload Growth and Equity funding provided to courts meeting the criteria, that is based on the RAS model, can also be used for this purpose. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Pay Parity	Address pay parity issues.	The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding provided to every court is funding available to address court employee compensation issues at the courts' discretion, including pay parity. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.) The Workload Growth and Equity funding provided to courts meeting the criteria, that is based on the RAS model, can also be used for this purpose. (Line 15 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Records Management	(a) Develop statewide plan on how to manage from beginning to end--include review of existing requirements; (b) Obtain statewide contract for vendor; and (c) Continue and expand CEAC Records Management working group.	The Cost Savings Operational Working Group reviewed records management as part of the issues they addressed. They decided not to pursue a statewide agreement for records retention as most trial courts needed to access records on the same day and firms could only provide a next day turnaround. However, it was noted that, as resources became available for statewide procurement, regional agreements would be pursued.
Kings	Retirement		The template funds at actual cost from SAL. (Line 7 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Sacramento	Retirement		The template funds at actual cost from SAL. (Line 7 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Del Norte	Salaries and Benefits	Trial court employees salaries and benefits.	The Inflation & Workforce portion of the SAL funding that all courts receive is designed to address salary and benefit funding needs at the court's discretion. (Line 14 in FY 2005-06 template.)

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
Del Norte	Security		The statewide security budget is grown by SAL. To the extent that funding is available after mandatory increases are addressed, additional funding will be allocated to bring courts closer to the funding standards. (Line 17 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Glenn	Security	Continue to make funding for security a priority.	Mandatory security increases for existing staff are already being funded, up to the level of the SAL adjustment rate. Funding for new screening stations and replacement of screening equipment is currently pending in the Governor's Budget. (Line 17 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Kings	Security	Security NSIs, retirement and other benefit costs	Mandatory security increases for existing staff are already being funded, up to the level of the SAL adjustment rate. (Line 17 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Sacramento	Security	Compensation and benefits.	Mandatory security increases for existing staff are already being funded, up to the level of the SAL adjustment rate. (Line 17 in FY 2005-06 template.)
San Mateo	Security	Funding for appropriate levels of courthouse security (building check-point and courtroom).	Funding for new screening stations and replacement of screening equipment is currently pending in the Governor's Budget. The statewide security budget is grown by SAL. To the extent that funding is available after mandatory increases are addressed, additional funding will be allocated to bring courts closer to the funding standards. (Line 17 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Yolo	Security	Funding for security equipment (x-ray machines and the additional staff to operate them) for our authorized screening stations.	Funding for new screening stations and replacement of screening equipment is currently pending in the Governor's Budget. The statewide security budget is grown by SAL. To the extent that funding is available after mandatory increases are addressed, additional funding will be allocated to bring courts closer to the funding standards. (Line 17 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Fresno	Self-Help	Increase self-help in areas other than Family Law.	The TCBWG believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers, which might include areas other than family law, is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Glenn	Self-Help	On-going funding for self help centers	The group believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Self-Help	Increase and maintain funding for Self-Service Centers.	The TCBWG believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
Nevada	Self-Help	Funding for our Public Law Center (self-help center). This Court received pilot money from the AOC around 2000. Then during the old BCR/BCP process we got AOC approval for our self help center, but it was never funded by DOF. So we have been keeping it open without it ever getting funded. Other self help centers have been funded either through earlier BCP processes, recent mini-grants or through the Self-Represented Litigants Task Force. If access is a Judicial Branch priority, and other Courts have received funding, I respectfully submit that courts that do not have self help centers or have them but never got them funded need to be given the same resources as those that do.	The TCBWG believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
San Bernardino	Self-Help	Particularly addressing small claims advisor service.	The TCBWG believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Small claims advisors are typically a part of self-help programs. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Stanislaus	Self-Help	Expanded self help programs for self represented litigants.	The TCBWG believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Small Claims Advisor Program	(a) Enhance local programs; and (b) Reach a larger audience.	The TCBWG believed that providing assistance to court users through the creation and enhancement of self-help centers is important in addressing the needs of their clients. Small claims advisors are typically a part of self-help programs. Recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Fresno	Technology	Funding for all statewide technology projects.	For courts implementing statewide infrastructure initiatives, they may request supplemental funding to address these needs. To the extent that other funds are not available, this is being recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Kern	Technology	Prioritize transitional costs for those courts that are migrating to the state-wide systems, (LAN WAN, CARS, CHRIS, CCMS) in which costs exceed that charged by their respective County for similar services. Given that we are just now obtaining the cost estimates on many of these initiatives, it is difficult to determine the amounts of funding required. As such, we may only be looking at one time or first year costs so that courts can budget in succeeding years for ongoing expenditures using SAL appropriations or other revenues.	For courts implementing statewide infrastructure initiatives, they may request supplemental funding to address these needs. To the extent that other funds are not available, this is being recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Monterey	Technology	Continue to fund court technology projects such as IVR, IWR, & video conferencing.	Twenty-eight courts have received funding since FY 2000-01 for IVR modules for jury management systems. Funding of these initiatives is expected to continue as requested by the courts. As for video conferencing, there is an ongoing joint IS and Education Division Video Infrastructure Project that is working in this area. Until standards in regard to this technology are considered, developed, and adopted, it would be premature for this area to be recommended as a JC priority.

Suggestions for FY 2006-2007 Judicial Council Priorities

Court/Agency	Priority Type	Comments	Rationale for Recommending or Not Recommending as a Budget Priority
Sacramento	Technology	Emphasis on case management systems.	A majority of Modernization Fund and TCIF funds are being allocated to case management systems. To the extent that a court does not have adequate funding to pay these costs, they may request supplemental funding. To the extent that other funds are not available, this is being recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Yolo	Technology	Start-up and on-going money for the statewide systems to be implemented; CARS, CHRIS and CCMS. One of the big start up costs for these systems is the "data warehousing" software costs to transition data from 58 court systems to these state systems.	For courts implementing statewide infrastructure initiatives, they may request supplemental funding to address these needs. To the extent that other funds are not available, this is being recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.) Data warehousing software is in the process of being added to these systems.
Yolo	Technology	Reinstate 2% automation funding.	The following response was sent to the court: Re the "reinstate 2% automation funding" - While those funds were redirected to statewide projects, the funds that previously went to the courts were replaced with an increase in the micrographics fee under the Uniform Civil Filing Fee proposal. This year, due to the Governor's veto, while the courts will receive the increased revenues in an amount approximately equivalent to the 2% automation funding, they had to take a reduction of about half that revenue to pay for the veto. If the pending technology BCP is approved and funded for FY 2006-07, the reduction will be eliminated.
San Bernardino	Technology	(a) Fully fund PC replacement; (b) Fund replacement of local telecommunications equipment (fund per AOC policy); and (c) Infrastructure systems funding (CCMS, CARS CHRIS).	PC replacement is being partially funded at a statewide level. The Inflation and Workforce portion of the SAL funding is also available to address PC replacement. A majority of statewide infrastructure services are being funded at a statewide level. If a court cannot afford to pay for the costs that are being charged to local courts, they can apply for supplemental funding. To the extent that other funds are not available, this is being recommended as a JC priority. (Line 9 and 10 in FY 2005-06 template.)
Glenn	Technology Staffing	On-going funding (actual cost) for IT staffing	Beginning in FY 2006-07, these funds will be added to each court's ongoing base budget.